



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXVIII.

BALTIMORE, MAY, 1913.

No. 5.

## A NOTE ON THE ACCENTUATION OF SOME FRENCH NAMES OF GERMANIC ORIGIN

The great mass of two-stem Germanic names in French and in Italian are stressed on the second stem: *Marbod-Marbeuf*, *Willihelm-Guillaume*, *Raginfriid-Rainfroi*. This condition of things is so self-evident that the mere statement is sufficient proof. But the prevalence of this mode of accentuation by no means excludes the possibility of another, either for individual names or, perhaps, individual stems. Thus, e. g., among Tuscan names of places and among Italian family names there are a few that seem to go back to Germanic two-stem names with the stress on the first and not on the second stem. This seems the best explanation for the Tuscan *Monte Cúccari*, *Cúccheri*, *Cúccoli* (also well-known family name); *Monte Taúpari*, *Tópari*, *Tópoli*; *Monte Góttari*, *Góttoli* (which I had occasion to mention, p. 60, *Etude sur quelques noms propres d'origine germanique*). As family name the well-known *Fóscari* may be quoted. Whether the second stem is *-rith* or *-hari* seems hard to decide.

In an article, "Beiträge zur romanischen Linguistik," Mr. Haberl, in an attack upon a previous article of Mr. Antoine Thomas, who considered that the proper names in *-hari* and the *nomina agentis* in *-ari* may have influenced the abnormal development of the Latin suffix *-arius*, says: "Dazu kommt aber der viel wichtigere Einwand, dass die von Thomas gegebene Erklärung vom germ. Standpunkt aus unmöglich ist. . . . Ferner tritt der Umlaut nur in germ. betonter Silbe ein, während *-ari* im Ahd. nicht den Hochton trägt. So wurde in nhd. *Günther* <ahd. *Guntahari* durch das *i* nicht der Vokal von *hari* umgelautet, sondern vielmehr das *u* zu *ü*. . . . Es ist also *hari* > *her* in Zusammensetzungen wie *Guntahari* > *Günther* nicht auf i-Umlaut sondern auf Abschwächung des unbetonten Vokals

zurückzuführen. Denn man darf nicht übersehen dass sich *-hari* nur als zweiter Bestandteil von Eigennamen im Fr. zu *-ier* entwickelt. Wenn *hari* als erster Bestandteil von Eigennamen verwendet wurde, trat später natürlich der i-Umlaut ein, da es in diesem Falle den Hauptton trug, vgl. ahd. *Haribert* > nhd. *Herbert*, fr. *Herbert*." <sup>1</sup>

Discretion being the better part of valor, the field of the suffix *-arius* and its relation to the Germanic names in *hari* shall be left to dough-tier champions. But the very interesting question of accentuation raised by Mr. Haberl's statement seems to open the way to some remarks which will hardly exhaust a subject worthy of a far completer study than has been made of it yet, but may help to throw a little light on it.

It is evident from the Romance point of view that Fr. *Gontier*, *Herbert* cannot possibly go back to a Germanic prototype stressed on the first stem, whose inevitable outcome would have been *\*Gontre*, *Gondre*; *\*Herbre* (or perhaps, by dissimilation *\*Herbe*); *Herbert*, *Gontier* must go back to a prototype accented on the last stem, and cannot be explained any other way. Incidentally it may be remarked that while the vowel is "umlauted" in Fr. *Herbert*, this is by no means the case in *Gontier*, as little as it is the case in Modern German *Walter*. Since, however, *Welter* is found in German beside *Walter*, it would appear that even from the Germanic view-point some discrimination between stems, or dialects, or periods would be in order.

As far as the stem *-hari* is concerned, it might be possible, even though *hari* was unstressed, to admit the substitution of the accented suffix *arius*, at some stage of its development. But no such supposition is possible for the mass of other stems which are to-day similarly stressed in French; what substitution is conceivable for *Marbeuf*, *Guillaume*, *Rainfroi*?

<sup>1</sup> ZRPb., xxxiv (1910), pp. 131-132.

There seems no sufficient reason to deny for *-ier* out of *-her* what is undeniable for every other second stem that shows the accented development of the vowel: it was stressed when it entered the French language; and this vital point being established, what else could the outcome of *-her* be?

The question may, indeed, be raised whether the Romance languages did not shift the stress to the second stem. But we know that on the whole the Romance languages, including French, as far as the old stock of words is concerned, have shown themselves exceedingly conservative with regard to the position of the stress. This position seems to be the one and only "stable" element in the French language. On the contrary, as long as the full meaning of each stem was still felt, the second stem may have preserved even in the Germanic dialects a notable amount of its original stress. This is very probable as long as the names of the parents were still taken apart to form new names for their children. The second stem *-brant* can have suffered no great weakening so long as Hiltibrant, "*Heribrantes* sunu," called his own child "*Hadubrant*." Compound words with equal or fluctuating stress on the two stems existed in Germanic.<sup>2</sup> Curme, p. 47 of his German grammar, states that certain compound names of places are generally, though not uniformly in all parts of the country, accented on the final component, *e. g.*, *Eberswâlde*. And if in the modern *Eberswâlde*, why not also in the ancient *Heriwâlt*, even though the final stem is not identical?

The stress being equal or fluctuating, it was very natural that the Romance languages, notably French, should have "fixed" this stress on the second stem, in accordance with their prevalent mode of accentuation, while later the Germanic languages "weakened" the second stem in accordance with their own habits of speech. This may not have happened synchronously in all dialects, and thus double forms for the same name like *Walter* / *Welter* may have arisen. What interests the question

before us more closely is that this divergence may also account for the peculiarity of accentuation of the Italian names which have been quoted, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, of some French names also.

In Italian, where there is no aversion to proparoxytones, these names are readily recognizable whenever they occur; in French, on the contrary, they are easily confused even in their modern form with related hypocoristic names, and in older sources, where the quality of the *e* is not marked, with names in *-ré*, out of *-rad*. Thus Langlois, in his valuable collection of the proper names found in the Old French *chansons de geste*, prints with *é* a whole series of names: *Baudré*, *Gondré*, *Guirré*, *Hardré*, *Houdré*, *Tangré*, etc. But some of these names have certainly lived not with a stressed but with an unstressed *e*. Didot-Bottin (1900) gives *Houdre*, *Tangre*, and *Aguirre*.<sup>3</sup>

These names presuppose an accented first stem: *Hold'rad*, *Tank'rad*, *Wir'rad* (or *Wird'rad*), if not *Hold'-*, *Tank'-*, *Wir'* with another stem. For, indeed, since, *e. g.*, *diaconum* gives *diacre*, *Lengones* gives *Langres*, and *Huidre* alternates with *Huidelon*, it is not always possible to decide beyond the possibility of a doubt what the second stem was. In the case of *Tangré*, *Tange*, given by Langlois (*Tangré le Puillant*, cousin de Boémond de Sicile, *Tange de Puille*) no doubt seems possible that it corresponds to the Italian "*Tancredi*." The phonetic development is not excessively clear, however, and perhaps "contamination" with some other stems, *e. g.*, *Thancger*, *Thangrim* found in Förstemann, is conceivable. Either of these

<sup>3</sup> The *A-* in *Aguirre* is explicable either as the preposition *à*, which is found in names like *Alloncle*, *Alamartine*, *Alabéatrice*, or perhaps better as the Celtic *ab*, 'son.' See *Répertoire général de bibliographie bretonne*, by René Kerville, at the article *Abailard*, "nom qui dérive du mot *Ab*, fils: *Ab. Aelard*, fils d'*Aelard*," and the bibliography given there. Other similar names are given by Kerville, among others *Abolivier*. Didot-Bottin gives, *Abhervé*, *Abraard*, *Abolard* (probably not to be confused with *Abélard*, but related to the English *Willard*), *Abriol*, *Aguillaume*, etc. Others like *Allouis*, seem to contain the preposition, and this is of course possible even with *Aguirre*, *Aguillaume*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Behaghel, *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, pp. 686 ff.

names would furnish an acceptable prototype for the "*Tangre*" given in Didot-Bottin.

Mr. Langlois himself gives with final silent *e*, *Ancre* (\**Ang'-hari*, *Marca Hispanica*, No. 28, a 866 *Angarius*; Förstemann, under *Ang*, *Ancho*, *Ancoïn*; or, under the stem *Ana*-*Ana-ger*); *Baire* (from \**Bag'-hari*, "*Baguier*, ferme," *Dictionnaire topogr. du Dép. du Gard*; or \**Baitharius* proposed by Förstemann as correction of *Baithanus*); *Guïres* (*Wir'rad*), *Lanfre* (*Land-frid*), and some others that are not so easily connected with a plausible Germanic prototype.

Of these *Baire* alone is found in Didot-Bottin, but it is scarcely doubtful that others would be brought to light by search elsewhere. Moreover Didot-Bottin gives other similar names not found in Langlois: we find *Affre*, *Baufre*, *Gauffre*, *Geoffre*, *Jaffre*, *Jauffre*, and *Joffre*; also *Meffre* and *Meiffre* (*Madifredus*, *Annales de Saint-Bertin*; Förstemann, *Meffrid* and *Mefred*). These names would show that it was not altogether unusual for the stem *-frid* to be unstressed. We also find *Hingres* (*Hincram*, cf. Italian *Inghirami*, which could, however, as well as Fr. *Ingres*, also go back to *Ingo-hram*, with a difference in the position of the stress; *Hinc-hari* is not impossible, in view of the German *Hinckers*, Andresen, *Die alt-deutschen Personennamen*); *Gibre* (*Gibhart*, German "*Gebhardt*," or \**Gibhari*?); *Gindre* (Förstemann, *Ginheri*); finally, very interesting on account of the preservation of the *l*, "*Thièble*," "*Tible*," beside the more common *Thiébaud*, *Thibaud*.

It is by no means surprising to find these names well represented in composition, especially with *-ville* and *-mont*. Thus we find *Baufremont*, *Thièblemont* beside *Baufre*, *Thièble*; *Antremont* beside *Antier* (Förstemann, *Antheri*): *Autremont* beside *Authier* (*Grégoire de Tours*, *Autharius*). Although not quite above suspicion since *Antre*- and even *Autre*-may have a very different origin, still they cannot be passed altogether in silence. That is also the case with *Astre* (Förstemann, *Asthar*) which may stand in the same relation to *Astier* in which *Autre*- may stand to *Authier* and may equally have nothing at all to do with it. In

individual cases the question might easily be settled by older documents. Clearer cases seem to be: *Dangreville* (for *d'Angreville*, out of *Angari-villa*, beside both *Angier* and *Anguier*); *Daubreville* beside *Aubier* (Förstemann, *Albheri*); *Landreville* beside *Landier* (*Département du Hérault*, *Lantier*, ferme); *Gondrecourt* beside *Gondré*.

The frequency of this composition makes it probable that some of the names previously mentioned did not develop independently, but were "shortened" later from an older compound form. Thus it is conceivable that a \**Barthari-villa* would regularly become \**Barthre-ville*, while \**Barthari* regularly became *Bar-tier*. The "shortened" \**Barthre* became confused with the hypocoristic *Bart*, or was dissimilated to *Barthe*, though the form *Bartrin* may indicate its existence; all this without prejudice to an independent development of \**Bart'-hari* to \**Barthre*. A similar condition of things is conceivable for *Batret*, beside *Batier*; *Bertron* beside *Bertier*, a long list of the hypocoristic *Bert*, and many *Berte*, some of which surely represent feminines, while a few may be dissimilated from \**Bertre*; *Gautron*, *Gautrin* beside *Gautier* and others. It is necessary to remark here, however, that the lengthening of a first stem by means of *l* or *r* was not unknown in Germanic names, though to judge from the examples given in Förstemann, it took place chiefly in Romance territory, and calls for further investigation. Thus Förstemann gives *Elbergaut*, *Baldrevert*, *Blandelcar*, from the *Pol. Irm*; *Bebrimod*, *Gadroald* from *Pardessus*, *Diplomata*, etc.; *Jadregisil*, the *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, and others. How far this corresponds to a reality, or is merely a wrong "latinisation" remains to be seen.

If, however, this development "in composition" is possible for some of the names under discussion, it is by no means probable for all; and whether they developed primarily in composition or independently, they all furnish a very valuable testimony with regard to Germanic names that are stressed not on the second but on the first stem. Only by a far more comprehensive and exhaustive study than it was possible to make here could we ascertain

what proved to be the decisive moment for this mode of accentuation, but even this brief notice may suffice to show the importance of these names in the discussion of stress in Romance names of Germanic origin, and not least among all, those whose second stem was *-hari*.

CHARLOTTE J. CIPRIANI.

Chicago.

---

### DIE MITLEIDSTHEORIE IN LESSINGS DRAMEN UND IHR WERT FÜR DIE GEGENWART

Die Namen Aristoteles, Corneille und Lessing bezeichnen die drei Höhepunkte in einer langen Reihe von Versuchen, die Mitleidstheorie zu erklären und Regeln für die Anwendung von Mitleidselementen im Drama aufzustellen. Aus der aristotelischen Erklärung und Bestimmung des Mitleids, wie sie im achten Kapitel des zweiten Buches der Rhetorik zu finden ist, geht hervor, dass es nicht dasselbe ist, was wir auf Grund der christlichen Lebensanschauung als Nächstenliebe und Barmherzigkeit kennen. Das aristotelische Mitleid beruht stets auf einem selbstsüchtigen Trieb und unterscheidet sich gerade durch diesen Charakterzug von dem Mitleid der späteren Dichter.

Corneille hatte sich sehr früh mit der Theorie des Dramas vertraut gemacht und durch seine Abhandlungen nicht nur gezeigt, dass es ihm mit seiner Kunst wirklich Ernst war, sondern er hat uns auch aus seiner Erfahrung manche, noch heute zu beherzigende Aufschlüsse und Lehren gegeben. Corneilles Mitleid aber ist nicht das eigentliche spontane Mitgefühl, sondern ein solches, das sich auf ein moralisches Urteil gründet, nämlich auf die moralische Überzeugung, dass der Held besser sei, und daher weniger zu leiden verdiene, als die andern Charaktere des Dramas. Mit anderen Worten, Corneilles Mitleid ist im Grunde genommen nur eine Abart des Parteigefühls, und zwar des moralischen Parteigefühls, das zweifellos von der grössten Bedeutung ist und deshalb

auch seine volle Berechtigung besitzt; so weit können wir uns Corneille anschliessen. Der Fehler, den Corneille begeht, liegt hauptsächlich darin, dass er dem Mitleidsbegriff, den er zu erweitern glaubte, eine verkehrte Beschränkung gibt.

Dem Einfluss einer neuen Geistesströmung sind auch die Theorien über das Mitleid nicht entgangen. Welche Stellung die Neuzeit diesem Problem gegenüber einnimmt, ist von der grössten Bedeutung, da eine Abweichung von den alten Theorien ihren Widerschein im Drama finden muss. Eine kurze Abschweifung ist daher geboten. Johannes Volkelt (*Ästhetik des Tragischen*, S. 359 f.) erklärt, es komme bei der Definition des Mitleids vor allem auf die Schmerzen, Kämpfe und den Untergang der tragischen Person an. Grosze Qualen seien besonders dazu angetan, Mitleid zu erwecken.—Karl Groos (*Einleitung in die Ästhetik*, S. 352 f.) nennt das Mitleid, dessen Name schon auf die innere Nachahmung hinweist, ein spielendes Eingehen unserer Seele in die tragische Handlung.—Georg Günther (*Grundzüge der tragischen Kunst*, S. 41 f.) entfernt sich von der üblichen Ansicht darin, dass er das aristotelische Mitleid nur als Mitgefühl anerkennen will.—Theodor Lipps (*Der Streit über die Tragödie*, S. 41 f.) nimmt an, dass dasjenige Gefühl als Mitleid bezeichnet werden könne, das nicht allein durch die Wahrnehmung des Schmerzes, sondern auch durch den Wert des geschädigten Lebens hervorgerufen wird.—Hans Laehr (*Die Wirkung der Tragödie nach Aristoteles*, S. 80 f.) ist der Ansicht, dass unser Mitleid viel allgemeiner sei, indem wir auch Leute damit umfassen, die ihr Unglück selbst verschuldet haben. Wir bemitleiden häufig andere um Übel, denen wir für uns selbst geringe Bedeutung beilegen.—F. Knocke (*Begriff der Tragödie nach Aristoteles*, S. 9 f.) versucht nachzuweisen, dass die Zurückführung des Mitleids auf die Besorgnis eigenen Unheils sich nicht aufrechterhalten lasse.—Fr. Paulsen (*System der Ethik*, 3. Aufl., Bd. II, S. 111 f.) nimmt an, dass im Mitleid das Gefühl der eigenen Sicherheit, Unverletztheit, Überlegenheit zu erkennen sei.—Auch A. Döring (*Die Kunstlehre des Aristoteles*, S. 310 f.) tritt der